DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 093 187 HE 005 289

AUTHOR Scott, Craig S., Comp.; Thorne, Gaylord, Comp.
TITLE Assessing Faculty Performance: A Partially Annotated Bibliography.
INSTITUTION Oregon State System of Higher Education, Monmouth. Teaching Research Div.
PUB DATE Jan 74
NOTE 20p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Bibliographies; Evaluation; *Faculty; *Higher Education; *Performance Criteria; *Teacher Evaluation; Teachers; Teaching

ABSTRACT

This partially annotated bibliography contains 139 references concerning assessment of faculty performance, including recent journal and book citations. (PG)

Assessing Faculty Performance:

A Partially Annotated Bibliography

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Compiled by

Craig S. Scott
Gaylord Thorne

Faculty Assessment Project
Teaching Research Division
Oregon State System of Higher Education

January 1974

Bibliography

Aleamoni, L. M., & Yimer, M. An investigation of the relationship between colleague rating, student rating, research productivity, and academic rank in rating instructional effectiveness. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1973, 64, 274-277.

Alkin, M. C., & Kosecoff, J. B. A new eclectic model for the redirection of evaluation efforts. CSE Report No. 84, Los Angeles, California: Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA Graduate School of Education, 1973.

This report includes a very general discussion of broad factors which influence the quality of evaluative efforts. Attention is called to consideration of a) specifying the audience and the decision makers, b) decision-making purposes, c) decision-maker motives, d) the stage of development of the evaluation object, and e) the socio-political setting of the evaluative effort.

Anderson, C. C., & Hunka, S. M. Teacher evaluation: Some problems and a proposal. Harvard Educational Review, 1963, 33(1), 74-95.

Anderson, D. D. A report to the commission on instruction of the American Association of Junior Colleges from the Committee on Evaluation of Instruction. (Mimeographed) The University of Iowa, Iowa City: AAJC, 1970.

A very good treatment of the evaluation problem and prospects for improvement in the existing situation in higher education.

Anikeeff, A. M. Factors affecting students' evaluations of college faculty members. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1953, 37, 458-460.

Astin, A. W., & Lee, C. B. T. Current practices in evaluation and training of college teachers. The Educational Record, 1966, 47, 361-375.

Baker, E. Teaching performance tests as dependent measures in instructional research. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 27, 1973.

This paper discusses the differences in requirements for teaching performance tests as dependent variables in instructional research and in performance evaluation.

Bausell, R. B., & Magoon, J. Instructional methods and college student ratings of courses and instructors. Journal of Experimental Education, 1972, 40(4), 29-33.

The authors used several multivariate statistical techniques to examine possible biases in student ratings in favor of certain instructional methods. Five methods were examined. Ratings suggested that students favored the discussion method of instruction, and independently mixed instructional methods. The straight lecture method consistently received lower ratings.

Beaty, E. Follow-up of teacher education graduates as a basis for institutional improvement. Peabody Journal of Education, 1969, 46, 298-302.

This article presents the results of a survey of teacher education graduates who were employed as teachers. The response rate was 64.3%. Some ideas for items may be found, though the actual questionnaire was not presented. Utility for teacher evaluation purposes is limited.

Belgard, M., Rosenshine, B., & Gage, N. L. The teacher's effectiveness in explaining: Evidence on its generality and correlation with pupils' ratings and attention scores. Explorations of the teacher's effectiveness in explaining. Technical Report No. 4, Stanford, California: Stanford Center for Research & Development in Teaching, Stanford University, 1968. Chapter 2, 9-20. (ERIC: ED 028 147)

Bendig, A. W. The relation of level of course achievement to student's instructor and course ratings in introductory psychology. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1953, 13, 437-448.

The author found some relation between student rating and student achievement, but it was not strong enough to influence the rank order of instructors which was produced by the scale.

Bernhard, H. A. A survey of faculty-evaluation programs administered by chapters of Tau Beta Pi. School and Society, 1950, 72, 102-105.

Bloom, B. S. (Ed.) Taxonomy of educational objectives handbook I: Cognitive domain. New York: David McKay, 1956.

Bloom, R., & Wilensky, H. Four observational categories for rating teacher behavior. Journal of Educational Research, 1967, 60, 464-465.

Bormuth, J. R. Evaluation and cost effectiveness analysis. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 27, 1973.

Boyer, M. Teacher evaluation: Toward improving instruction. ERIC Junior College Research Review, 1970, 4, 1-4.

Brock, E. H. Rating teaching personnel for advancement purposes. Journal of Engineering Education, 1954, 44, 593-599.

Brogan, H. O. Evaluation of teaching. Improving College and University Teaching, 1968, 16, 191-192.

Brown, D. W. Teach or perish. Improving College and University Teaching, 1967, 15, 108-110.

Bruner, J. S. Toward a theory of instruction, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press, 1967.

In this book Bruner states his belief that the most important reason for evaluation is not that it results in the identification of ineffective teachers, but rather that it provides information or feedback for instructional improvement.

Carpenter, F., Van Egmond, E., & Jochem, J. Student preference of instructor types as a function of subject matter. Science Education, 1965, 45, 235-238.

Cassel, R. N. Professional productivity of graduates as evidence of faculty effectiveness. Improving College and University Teaching, 1969, 17, 191-192.

Cassel makes a good case for including as one of the criteria of graduate faculty effectiveness an index of the level, amount, and quality of productivity of their present and former students. Examples of suggested indices include: papers presented by graduate student to professional organizational meetings; drop-out rate--i.e., percentage of master's level students who opt not to continue their training; and drop-in rate--i.e., percentage of students who raise their educational aspirations early in their graduate training. Other types of information could be gained through follow-up of graduates.

Centra, J. A. Strategies for improving college teaching. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1972.

Centra, J. A. What instructors learn from students: Student and faculty ratings of instruction. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, 1972.

This study examines the degree of unique information provided for instructors via student ratings of their performance in the classroom. The sample for this correlational study consisted of 343 teaching faculty from five diverse institutions. The instrument was made up of 21 items, most of which were set up with a 4-point agree-disagree scale with a "not applicable" option. Correlations between instructor's self-ratings and their students' ratings indicated "only moderate agreement in the way faculty and students perceived instruction" [p. 3]. In general, instructors rated themselves higher than did their students.

Coats, W. D. & Swierenga, L. Student perceptions of teachers: A factor analytic study. Journal of Educational Research, 1972, 65, 357-360.

This study presents the results of a factor analysis of 1,427 seventh through twelfth grade students' responses of their perceptions of their teachers. Results indicated that when rating teachers, these students placed the most importance on teacher popularity and charismatic traits.

Coffman, W. E. Determining students' concepts of effective teaching from their ratings of instructors. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1954, 45, 227-286.

Cohen, A. M., & Brower, F. B. Measuring faculty performance: Monograph No. 4. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.

Cole, J. R., & Cole S. The Ortega hypothesis. Science, 1972, 178, 368-375.

This analysis suggests that the number of researchers that actually contribute to scientific progress is quite few in relation to the number of active researchers. Citation analysis was employed on a variety of major physical science publications and authors. The article raises a number of questions regarding the utility of research.

Constance, C. L. Forms for gathering data on teaching loads. Journal of Experimental Education, 1962, 31, 119-120.

Cosgrove, D. J. Diagnostic rating of teacher performance. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1959, 50, 200-204.

Costin, F., Greenough, W. T., & Menges, R. J. Student ratings of college teaching: Reliability, validity, and usefulness. Review of Educational Research, 1971, 41(5), 511-535.

A very comprehensive review of the research related to the use of student ratings in college settings. Among the noteworthy conclusions are: a) that students rate instructors "with a reasonable degree of accuracy" [p. 513], b) "that student ratings correlated positively with alumni ratings of the same instructor" [p. 516], and c) that very little support has been found to support the contention that student ratings correlate with or are unduly influenced by either the students' or the instructor's personality traits. This paper is one that is a must reading for those interested in student ratings.

Cox, R. F. Improvement of instruction in 78 colleges. Improving College and University Teaching, 1968, 16, 165-166.

A 315 item questionnaire was developed and administered to administrators on 78 campuses. The questionnaire covered a very broad range of topics in an interestingly different and informative kind of format. Methods of improving instructional quality might be pinpointed using this type of format. The instrument is available from the author.

Crawford, P. L., & Bradshaw, H. L. Perception of characteristics of effective university teachers: A scaling analysis. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1968, 28, 1079-1085.

Cromack, T. R. Teacher behavior as a measure of teaching effectiveness: Reinforcing and questioning. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 27, 1973.

Cronbach, L. J. Evaluation for course improvement. Teachers College Record, 1963, 64, 672-683.

Dressel, P. L. Evaluation of instruction. Journal of Farm Economics, 1967, 49, 299-314.

"In the long run," Dressel comments, "the continuing attempt of a faculty to improve instruction and the insights that emerge from this attempt will develop an atmosphere in which better and more extensive evidence on the quality of instruction will be available for recognition and reward" [p. 313].

Dwyer, F. M. A review of characteristics and relationships of selected criteria for evaluating teacher effectiveness. University Park, Pennsylvania: Division of Instructional Services, Pennsylvania State University, 1968.

A good review of factors which relate to student ratings of instructors, instructor ratings by colleagues, and supervisor or other observer evaluation of instructors. The author concluded that the reliability of student ratings was very much a function of the number of raters. Significant relationships were not found between student ratings and years of teaching experience, age of instructor, class size, sex of instructor or student, severity of grading procedures, or rater maturity.

Eble, K. E. Career development of the effective college teacher. Washington, D. C.: American Association of University Professors, 1971. (a)

This work is a collaborative effort of the author and of the participants in a series of conferences on career development. It deals with many important aspects of the continuing career development of college teachers. There is a particularly good discussion of the reward system and its influence within the university setting on general performance. Problems which arise due to secrecy within the salary, promotion, and tenure process are also discussed.

Eble, K. E. The recognition and evaluation of teaching. Washington, D. C.: American Association of University Professors, 1971. (b)

This is an exceptionally good treatment of the sensitive subject. It does a particularly good job with important aspects of student evaluations including: instruments, procedures, and impacts. Related research dealing with each of these aspects is also reported in a very readable and understandable manner. Issues relating to construction and administration of the rating forms are also discussed. Utilization of data from these rating administrations in decision making is also covered in a manner which speaks directly to commonly raised questions and concerns.

Eble, K. E. Professors as teachers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Eckert, R. E. Ways of evaluating college teaching. School and Society, 1950, 71, 65-69.

Elton, C. F., & Rose, H. A. What are the ratings rating? American Psychologist, 1972, 27, 197-201.

This study uses data which are commonly in the public domain (i.e., # of specialization areas, # of departmental faculty, # of Ph.D.'s, # of full-time students, # of first-year students, and ratio of part-time to full-time students) to examine institutional ratings. A close positive relationship was found between departments' ratings and departments' size. The authors question the inferences being made by the American Council on Education regarding quality being related to size in the light of the absence of data which bear on instructional quality.

Enthoven, A. C. Measures of the outputs of higher education: Some practical suggestions for their development and use. In B. Lawrence, G. Weathersby, and V. W. Patterson, Outputs of higher education: Their identification, measurement, and evaluation. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1970.

Fitch, N. Evaluation of instructors in California junior colleges. Berkeley: University of California, 1965.

Flanagan, J. C. The critical incident technique. Psychological Bulletin, 1954, 51, 327-358.

Flewellen, W. C. Faculty evaluation: The University of Georgia case. In Selected papers presented at the 1972 annual meeting and 1971 seminars for new and senior deans from proceedings of the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business. St. Louis: AACSB, 1972.

This paper describes the events which took place when the author instigated faculty evaluation in a systematic fashion. Instruments used in each of three evaluation areas are also presented. Problems are discussed in some detail. A good paper that is generally indicative of what might follow after an institution or department makes a genuine effort at systematic evaluation.

Fox, A. M., & Brookshire, W. K. Defining effective college teaching. Journal of Experimental Education, 1971, 40(2), 37-40.

Using a modified Delphi Technique with the School of Education faculty at the University of Northern Colorado, a definition of effective college teaching was derived. The definition included five categories. These five characteristics were used to develop 25 profiles of faculty members. Sixty-one faculty members were used as judges of the promotability of each of the fictitious profiles. Regression analysis results indicated that, of the five characteristics, professional qualities accounted for most of the variance in terms of effective teaching. "Personal characteristics, interpersonal relationships, and communication skills were approximately equally valued as second in importance. Technical skills of teaching was least important" [p. 40].

Frey, P. W. Student ratings of teaching: Validity of several rating factors. Science, 1973, 182, 83-85.

The author correlated student ratings of instructors with the final grades they earned in the rated instructor's classes. The rating questionnaire was comprised of items which when combined made up six instructional factors. These included: grading, organization planning, student accomplishment, teacher accessibility, teacher's presentation, and work load. Work load and teacher accessibility were the only two factors that were not useful in the regression analysis for predicting final examination performance.

Frey, P. W., & Mathis, B. C. Comparative judgment scaling of student course ratings. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 27, 1973.

Gadzella, B. M. College students' views and ratings of an ideal professor. College and University, 1968, 44, 89-96.

Gaff, J. G. Teachers who make a difference. Paper presented at the first invitational conference on Faculty Effectiveness as Evaluated by Students, by the Measurement and Research Center, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, April 25-27, 1973.

The author makes a strong case for increasing the presently limited use of student ratings in research writing, in theory development, and in general practice.

Gaff, J. G., & Wilson, R. C. The relationship between professors' views of the formal incentive system and their career status. Paper presented at the meeting of the Western Psychological Association, Vancouver, British Columbia, June 1969.

Gaff, J. G., & Wilson, R. C. The teaching environment. AAUP Bulletin, 1971, 57, 475-493.

A good treatment of the nature of a general university "environment" and how it is influenced by the belief structures of those who operate within the institution(s). The dual reward structure is discussed with emphasis upon the influence of the structures on teaching performance. The nature of the resources used to support the teaching function and the influence of the resources on instructional performance on the campus is also discussed. Specific proposals are made regarding ways to improve the teaching environment in higher education settings.

Gage, N. L. The appraisal of college teaching: An analysis of ends and means. Journal of Higher Education, 1961, 32, 17-22.

Gage, N. L. Alternative strategies for identifying teaching skill. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 26, 1973.

Gates, M., & Burnett, C. W. Students' perceptions of professors. Improving College and University Teaching, 1969, 17, 234-236.

Students generally concluded that the lasting effects of motivation rather than the learning characterized their good teachers. The methodology was R-sort and the sample consisted of 15 undergraduate and 15 graduate Ohio State University students.

Gauss, J. Teacher evaluation. Phi Delta Kappan, 1962, 43, 182.

Gauss made a facetious rating of Socrates. He concluded that he was poor in "self-confidence" and in "daily preparation." The conclusion made, on the basis of the rating, was that he "does not have a place in education--should not be rehired" [p. 182]. The essay makes for interesting reading and serves to underscore the need to use caution in constructing, in analyzing, and in interpreting the results of student ratings of instructor's classroom performance.

Gessner, P. K. Evaluation of instruction. Science, 1973, 180, 566-569.

Supports the teaching effectiveness feedback function of student ratings. This is one of the most important uses that can be made of these types of data.

Gustad, J. W. Policies and practices in faculty evaluation. Educational Record, 1961, 42, 194-211.

Gustad surveyed the policies and practices of 584 institutions of higher education. He states that: "What was somewhat surprising was the extent and depth of the chaos. The majority of institutions studied said that they placed principal weight on teaching ability, but no even approximately effective method of evaluating this seems to be in use. Scholarship is evaluated by bulk rather than by quality. Other factors are evaluated on a hit-or-miss basis. To say that higher education needs to get its own house in order is something of an understatement."

Hayes, R. B. A way to measure classroom teaching effectiveness. Journal of Teacher Education, 1963, 14, 168-176.

An account of the development of a unidimensional instrument for measuring college students' attitudes toward their teachers.

Herman, J. J. Developing an effective school staff evaluation program. West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Co., 1973.

Hildebrand, M., Wilson, R. C., & Dienst, E. R. Evaluating university teaching. Berkeley, California: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1971. (ERIC 051-748)

This work describes in detail the development of several scales for obtaining student and colleague descriptions of teachers' behaviors. The results of ratings derived from over 1600 students and faculty are

reported. Evaluation as a topic for consideration in university settings and the implications of such processes are also discussed. The scale described herein is well researched. The authors have demonstrated that its five scales are capable of distinguishing between effective and ineffective teachers.

Holmes, D. S. Evaluating teacher effectiveness. In F. F. Harcleroad and J. H. Cornell (Eds.), Assessment of colleges and universities. Iowa City, Iowa: The American College Testing Program, 1971.

Holmes, D. S. Effects of grades and disconfirmed grade expectancies on students' evaluations of their instructor. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1972, 63, 130-133.

The data of this study indicate that actual grades attained by students did not influence their subsequent ratings of instructors per se. However, students who received lower grades than they expected (i.e., their grade expectancies were disconfirmed) rated their instructors lower in areas of teaching performance in more than just the grading system area. In other words, the depreciation in ratings resulting from the disconfirmations of grades expected generalized to other areas in addition to the grading areas.

Hoyt, D. P. Improving instruction through student feedback. Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University, Office of Educational Resources, 1969. (a)

Hoyt, D. P. Instructional effectiveness: I. Measurement of effectiveness. Research Report No. 6. Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University, Office of Educational Resources, 1969. (b)

Hoyt, D. P., Owens, R. E., & Grouling, T. Interpreting student feedback on instruction and courses: A manual for using student feedback to improve instruction. Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University, Office of Educational Resources, 1973.

This manual provides information which is very useful for interpreting the Kansas State University student rating scale. Copies of the scale and related documents may be obtained by writing to the author.

Hunter, J. O. Faculty evaluation as a liberal persuasion. Improving College and University Teaching, 1969, 17, 90-92.

Discusses the flexible use of student ratings, visitation, colleague relationships, and portfolio preparation as they relate to faculty evaluation.

Jenkins, J. R., & Bausell, R. B. How teachers view the effective teacher. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 27, 1973.

Justiz, T. D. A method for identifying the effective teacher. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1968 (University Microfilms Order No. 69-5321).

Karman, T. A. Faculty evaluation. Liberal Education, 1969, 55, 539-544.

A good article on faculty assessment. The need is stressed for building into the evaluation system adequate adjustment time so that the behavior of those evaluated can, if necessary, be changed (improved) before it is too late.

Kaufman, R. A. A possible integrative model for the systematic and measurable improvement of education. American Psychologist, 1971, 26(3), 250-256.

King, J. H., & Ellis, J. R. A survey of the characteristics judged to contribute to the ineffectiveness of college teacher educators. Journal of Teacher Education, 1971, 22, 331-334.

This study attempts to examine, via a purely descriptive survey analysis, the characteristics associated with college instructors who were judged to be ineffective in either research, service, or teaching. Only college level administrators' opinions were solicited in the survey. Results of the analysis are not extremely informative and simply indicate that those teachers who are not successful in one or more of their three professorial functions lack motivation, fail to publish, are poorly organized, use poor methods, etc.

Klein, S. P., & Alkin, M. C. Evaluating teachers for outcome accountability. Evaluation Comment, 1972, 3(3), 5-11.

This article presents problems associated with making evaluation systems fair and objective for all of the teachers who are to be assessed. Various adjustment factors which will take into account personal differences in teachers are discussed.

Langen, T. D. Student assessment of teaching effectiveness. Improving College and University Teaching, 1966, 14, 22-25.

Lawrence, B., Weathersby, G., & Patterson, V. W. (Eds.), Outputs of higher education: Their identification, measurement, and evaluation. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1970.

Lovell, G. D., & Haner, C. F. Forced-choice applied to college faculty ratings. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1955, 15, 291-304.

This article discusses the construction as well as the advantages and disadvantages of forced-choice ratings. The chief advantage is that they reduce the possible faking of responses for students who wish to assign very high or very low ratings regardless of objectivity.

Mager, R. F. Developing attitude toward learning. Palo Alto, California: Fearon, 1968.

Contains good discussions of course and instructor observation techniques which may be of use in the design of evaluative criteria.

Mayhew, L. B. A tissue committee for teachers. Improving College and University Teaching, 1967, 15, 5-10.

Mayhew, a Stanford University professor, makes a case for the routine collection of a) end of semester reports (including all prof. activities); b) end of year reports; c) reports of visits by administrators; d) records of random student comments; e) results of student ratings on surveys; f) students' standardized test performance (if available); g) personal document file (i.e., offers from other institutions); and h) professional consultation records. He also suggests that self-administered check lists could double as a student evaluation form.

McGrath, E. J. Characteristics of outstanding college teachers. Journal of Higher Education, 1962, 33, 148-152.

McKeachie, W. J. Student's ratings of faculty. AAUP Bulletin, 1969, 55, 439-444.

This article presents suggestions and comments on the use of evaluation by student ratings of college faculty. Scale choosing, building, and administration are also discussed.

McKeachie, W. J. Student evaluations keyed to function. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, April 4, 1972.

McNeil, J. D. Concomitants of using behavioral objectives in the assessment of teaching effectiveness. Journal of Experimental Education, 1967, 36, 69-74.

Meredith, G. M. Dimensions of faculty-course evaluation. The Journal of Psychology, 1969, 73, 27-33.

This paper is a good example of an empirical investigation of the structure of faculty-course evaluation. Those interested in constructing faculty-course rating instruments would find it helpful to consult this source. The necessity of having rating scales cover both instructor and instructional impact areas is discussed. While these factors do not describe the complete domain of what should be included in a scale, they represent a major portion. Assessing unexpected or unpredictable outcomes of the learning in a classroom is also discussed as "one of the challenges of evaluation theory" [p. 31].

Miller, M. T. Instructor attitudes toward, and their use of, student ratings of teacher. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1972, 63(3), 235-239.

An empirical study in which instructors with varying attitudes toward ratings by students received what were essentially the same end-of-semester ratings from their students. However, the fact that some instructors received feedback on their ratings seemed to lead to slightly higher end-of-semester ratings than were obtained by instructors who did not receive any feedback on their ratings.

Miller, R. I. Evaluating faculty performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Covers all traditional and some innovative aspects of measuring faculty performance. Has general advice for implementation and very specific advice on instruments to use. One of the most practical and comprehensive sources currently available.

Millman, J. Psychometric characteristics of performance tests of teaching effectiveness. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 27, 1973.

Musella, D., & Rusch, R. Student opinion on college teaching. Improving College and University Teaching, 1968, 16, 137-140.

This article examines differences between the student ratings of teachers from a number of fields. Results indicated that teacher behaviors and teacher characteristics associated with effective teaching varied for students from arts and sciences versus students from biological and physical sciences.

Neeley, M. A teacher's view of teacher evaluation. Improving College and University Teaching, 1968, 16, 207-209.

The author makes a case for placing more value on the teaching function in higher education as opposed to the classical research and service functions.

Openshaw, M. K. & Cyphert, F. R. The development of a taxonomy for the classification of teacher classroom behavior. Columbus: Ohio State University Research Foundation, 1966.

Owens, M. S. Evaluation of teaching competence by three groups of educators. Journal of Experimental Education, 1971, 40(2), 77-82.

Perceptions of teaching competence as held by teachers, college supervisors, and public school administrators were compared using the 27 scales of the Instrument for the Observation of Teaching Activities (IOTA). Both classroom behavior and teaching competency were compared. Results indicated that each group of educators perceived teaching in very similar manners. The feasibility of using the IOTA as a tool for evaluating teaching competence is also discussed. Results were relatively encouraging in this respect.

Pace, C. R. Thoughts on the evaluation of higher education. Iowa City, Iowa: The American College Testing Program, 1972.

Pankratz, R., & Williams, J. A research model for the development of a teacher competency measure in facilitating problem-solving skills. Experimental competency based teacher education. Emporia, Kansas: Kansas State Teachers College, Teacher Corps Project, 1973.

Paulson, C. F., Jr. A strategy for evaluation design. Monmouth, Oregon: Teaching Research Division, Oregon State System of Higher Education, 1970.

This work presents an evaluation strategy which focuses upon evaluation as a series of tasks that must be dealt with by the evaluator. Evaluation purpose, definition, instrumentation, processing, distribution, and management methodology are all discussed at length. The emphasis is on program or project evaluation, but a number of the principles are directly applicable to instructor and instruction evaluation.

PDK. National Study Committee on Evaluation. Educational evaluation and decision making. Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock, 1971.

This edited book discusses a wide variety of topics relating to the relationship between educational decision making and evaluative efforts. Strong points as well as inadequacies of current evaluation trends are examined in a largely medical based model--i.e., symptoms of evaluation inadequacies are referred to as symptoms of "evaluation's illness" and the inadequacies themselves are described in some detail in a section entitled, "The Etiology of the Illness." Problems related to definition, decision making, values and criteria, administrative levels, and the research model of evaluation are each considered separately. In all, a wide variety of topics relating to the organization of evaluative efforts are covered in treatments which are very comprehensive and, at times, quite technical. All of the treatments view evaluation as a process of specifying, acquiring, and applying relevant data for making judgmental administrative decisions.

Peck, R. F., & Veldman, D. J. Personal characteristics associated with effective teaching. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 27, 1973.

Popham, W. J. An evaluation guidebook. Los Angeles: Instructional Objectives Exchange, 1972. (a)

Popham, W. J. California's precedent-setting teacher evaluation law. Educational Researcher, 1972, 1(7), 13-15. (b)

This essay discusses the content and the implications of California's new teacher evaluation law. The law requires yearly evaluations of all elementary and secondary teachers within the State. The evaluation methodology is not specifically defined and funds were not provided. However, strict guidelines were adopted. It is possible that this piece of legislation will serve as a model for other state legislatures as well as for other educational levels if the legislators feel that within-system evaluative procedures are not adequate in terms of rigor, reliability and/or validity.

Popham, W. J. Objectives-based management strategies for large educational systems. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, April 6, 1972. (c)

Popham, W. J. Applications of teaching performance tests to inservice and preservice teacher education. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 26 through March 1, 1973.

Pogue, F. G., Jr. Students' ratings of the "ideal teacher." Improving College and University Teaching, 1967, 15, 133-136.

Rees, R. D. Dimensions of students' points of view in rating college teachers. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1969, 60, 476-482.

This study concludes that students view their teachers in a variety of ways depending upon a number of personality and background factors. Interactions between students' and teachers' personalities are discussed as they relate to the resultant ratings.

Remmers, H. H. On students' perceptions of teachers' effectiveness. In W. J. McKeachie (Ed.), The appraisal of teaching in large universities. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1958.

This article contains, among other things, a very key quote: "No teacher has any choice as to whether he wishes to be judged by his students. The only choice he has is whether he wishes to know how he is judged and thus possibly capitalize on his feedback" [p. 20]. This is certainly a point worth considering.

Remmers, H. H. The college professor as the student sees him: II. In Studies in higher education No. 93, Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University Measurement and Research Center, 1966.

Nostalgic though somewhat empirical treatment of the history of faculty ratings at Purdue University. The author discusses the "Purdue Rating Scale for Instructors" (PRSI) and the "Purdue Instructor Performance Indicator" (PIPI). The PRSI, a 26-item scale, produced a .95 reliability coefficient (using parallel forms over a 3-week period). The paper also contains a list of 18 "research" conclusions which are not cited or referenced in any specific fashion. Because of this, they appear less credible than they may actually be.

Renner, R. R. A successful rating scale. Improving College and University Teaching, 1967, 15, 12-14.

Renner makes the point that students do not have the training that is necessary to judge the suitability of their professors' methods. However, they (the students) can certainly judge whether the course was valuable for them. Ratings appear to be the index that "most sharply focus on teaching itself, both the content and the process" [p. 12].

Roid, G. H. Learning about ratings vs. rating learning: Some questions about questionnaires in course evaluation. Learning and Development, 1971, 3(4), 1-3. (a)

This article first defines instructional effectiveness and then discusses the two primary inputs that students can make regarding its evaluation. First, students can identify problems which relate to administrative and management concerns. Second, they can assess the extent to which they have learned from exposure to a specific course and from exposure to a specific instructor.

Roid, G. H. Towards a system of course evaluation. Learning and Development, 1971, 2(6), 1-5. (b)

Roid, G. H. Systems design for course evaluation. Montreal, Canada: McGill University Centre for Learning and Development, 1972.

This paper discusses course evaluation as a complete process which involves much more than the use of questionnaires. Aspects of courses to be evaluated are described in an ideal fashion and these are incorporated into a system of course evaluation. The role of rewards and incentives in evaluation is also discussed.

Rosenshine, B. Evaluation of classroom instruction. Review of Educational Research, 1970, 40(2), 279-300.

This review describes instruments which are available for use in observing and evaluating classroom instruction. The dearth of research on rating forms is discussed. General classroom data are described as needed entities for instructional program modification.

Rowland, R. Can teaching be measured effectively? Improving College and University Teaching, 1970, 18, 153-157.

The author presents a strong case in favor of viewing evaluation of college teaching "as a means of accomplishing over-all improvement rather than as a threat to specific individuals" [p. 157]. Evaluation viewed in this context can be much more useful than if it is thought of as only being applicable to personnel concerns.

Samalonis, B. Ratings by students. Improving College and University Teaching, 1967, 15, 11.

The author favors student ratings of professors and raises a number of questions. Among those raised are: (a) Will all students rate profs? (b) Will students only rate profs in their major areas? (c) Should only graduates rate profs? and (d) Should fill-in profs be rated? The point is also made that "The faculty member who is adept at writing but who dislikes teaching must not fear that his academic career is at an end" [p. 11]. Ratings should be viewed as an additional factor.

Sexson, J. E. A method for computing faculty load. Improving College and University Teaching, 1967, 15, 219-222.

Shao, O. H. Faculty evaluation plan in a liberal arts college. Liberal Education, 1968, 54, 413-417.

Simmons, J. C. What is a full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty unit? College and University, 1970, 46, 33-36.

Simmons presents a standard formula definition of faculty full-time equivalent (FTE). The most interesting aspect of the article is due to a statement made by the author regarding publishing pressures. "As publications are the only basis for academic recognition, for promotion and for tenure in most professional areas, faculty members, if they act rationally (and faculty members should), will neglect teaching and put more time in research" [p. 35]. The implications of such a mentality for instructional quality are frightening. The implications which this type of attitude places on instructor evaluation and effort are clear. If we value quality teaching, then it must be a permanent part of the formal reward structure.

Simpson, R. H. Teacher self-evaluation. New York: MacMillan, 1966.

This book covers a variety of topics including: the need for self-evaluation, procedures and tools for systematic self-diagnosis and self-improvement, personal goal setting and self-evaluation, and interpersonal relations with colleagues. Numerous self-evaluation instruments, items, and formats are also presented.

Slobin, D. Y., & Nichols, D. G. Student ratings of teaching. Improving College and University Teaching, 1969, 17, 244-247.

Smith, P. Teaching, research, and publications as they affect academic performance and promotion. Journal of Higher Education, 1961, 32, 199-205.

Smock, R., & Crooks, T. A plan for the comprehensive evaluation of college teaching. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 27, 1973.

The authors identify types of data, data collection processes, data sources and types of audiences for comprehensive evaluation of college instructor's performance. Inputs from students, colleagues, departmental administrators are also discussed. The utility of the various types of inputs and outputs are also discussed at length. A broad treatment of a college-level assessment process is presented in a useful format. The Illinois evaluation form and a discussion of a number of statistical considerations are included in an appendix.

Solomon, D. Teacher behavior dimensions, course characteristics, and student evaluations of teachers. American Educational Research Journal, 1966, 3, 35-47.

Spaights, E. Students appraise teachers' methods and attitudes. Improving College and University Teaching, 1967, 15, 15-17.

This study appraises teachers' methods and attitudes using a sample of 172 Ohio State University Freshmen. Sixty-nine were identified as high achieving (HA) and 52 were identified as low achieving (LA). Results of the descriptive analysis indicated that the HA group was more critical of college instruction in general than the LA's--i.e., their college teaching ideal model was higher. LA students saw professors as being more impersonal, dictatorial, and sarcastic. HA students saw professors as more patronizing. LA students cited a need for professors to listen to students' problems more. They also saw a need for closer student-faculty associations.

Starry, A. R., Derry, J. O., & Wright, G. L. An automated instructor and course appraisal system. Educational Technology, May 1973, 61-64.

Stasz, C. M., Weinberg, S., & McDonald, F. J. The influence of sex of student and sex of teacher on students' achievement and evaluation of the teacher. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 26, 1973.

Stewart, C. T., & Malpass, L. F. Estimates of achievement and ratings of instructors. Journal of Educational Research, 1966, 59, 347-350.

Taft, M. I. A systematic method for evaluating teachers. Journal of Engineering Education, 1969, 59, 852-857.

Tolor, A. Evaluation of perceived teacher effectiveness. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1973, 64, 98-104.

This study examines the judgmental processes used by students, parents, faculty members, and administrators to assess teacher competence. Results indicate that there is a moderate degree of agreement between the rating groups. An exception to this agreement arose between students' identification of unsatisfactory teachers and all other groups' identification of unsatisfactory teachers. The importance of examining the rater dimension when examining teacher effectiveness is also discussed.

Touq, D. S., Feldhusen, J. & Halstead, J. Criterion-referenced validity of student ratings of instructors. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 27, 1973.

Van Fleet, D. D. Salary administration in higher education: A tentative plan. AAUP Bulletin, 1972, 58, 413-418.

This plan sets up criteria for salary adjustment and promotion which reward all of the major aspects of performance that are generally recognized for higher education.

Veldman, D. J., & Brophy, J. E. Measuring teacher effects on pupil achievement. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 27, 1973.

Weaver, C. H. Instructor rating by college students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1960, 51, 21-25.

The data of this study suggest that there is a strong positive and predictable relationship between the grade a student expects to receive in a given course and the rating that he gives to the course's instructor. No implications of the finding are discussed though there are many.

Wellman, E. A. Report of Senate Welfare Committee on faculty workload study. Klamath Falls, Oregon: Oregon Institute of Technology, 1969.

This report displays the results of a survey of currently used faculty workload formulas in vocational oriented post-secondary institutions.

Whitfield, R. P., & Brammer, L. M. The ills of college teaching: Diagnosis and prescription. Journal of Higher Education, 1973, 44, 1-14.

This article suggests avenues that a college or university might employ to meet current criticisms of higher education. Emphasis is given to describing the evolution of teaching shortcomings.

Widlak, F. W., McDaniel, E., & Feldhusen, J. F. Factor analysis of an instructor rating scale. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 27, 1973.

This paper is a good example of the application of multivariate statistical techniques to data derived from student ratings of instructor's competence.

Wilhelms, F. T. (Ed.), Evaluation as feedback and guide. Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum, National Education Association, 1967.

This book contains discussions of evaluation as feedback, the state of the art, evaluation and the teaching-learning process, learning and evaluation, teaching and evaluation, evaluation and the large organization, and cooperative evaluation. This is a good general source book for those interested in either overall educational outputs or assessing faculty performance. A section on related statistics has also been included.

Wilson, R. C., Dienst, E. R., & Watson, N. L. Characteristics of effective college teachers as perceived by their colleagues. Journal of Educational Measurement, 1973, 10, 31-37.

This paper examines dimensions of faculty members associated with good teaching. Five distinct factors were produced, using principal-components analysis. These included: "research activity and recognition, participation in academic community, intellectual breadth, relations with students, and concern for teaching." Each of these factors or dimensions was identified as being "used" by faculty members when describing persons whom they believed were effective teachers.

Wilson, R. C., & Gaff, J. G. The use of the Faculty Characteristics Questionnaire in institutional research and policy formulation. In C. T. Stewart (Ed.), Institutional research and institutional policy formulation: 11th annual forum of the association for institutional research, 1971. Claremont, California: Claremont University Center, 1971.

Wolff, W. M. Publication problems in psychology and an explicit evaluation schema for manuscripts. American Psychologist, 1973, 28, 257-261.

Woodring, P. Who makes university policy? Saturday Review, April 17, 1965, 48, 65-66.

The author makes the point that "The greatest potential contribution of students--and the one most threatening to faculty--is that of rating the competence of professors as classroom teachers. Students who sit through entire courses know much more about the effectiveness of teachers than do professors who rarely visit the classrooms of their colleagues. The judgment of any individual may reflect his own biases, but if the entire classes are polled anonymously, as they are now in a number of universities, the combined judgment cannot safely be ignored" [p. 66]. The author concludes that the information is critical to decision making but that the personnel decisions must be reserved for the faculty and administration, not the students.

Yonge, G. D., & Sassenrath, J. M. Student personality correlates of teacher ratings. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1968, 59, 44-52.

This study examines personality correlates of student ratings. While certain personality factors were found to have different meanings for different instructors, the influence of the factors was not great enough to invalidate student ratings of instructors so long as each student was rating from the same, defined or standardized, point of view or context.

Hildebrand, M. How to recommend promotion for a mediocre teacher without actually lying. Journal of Higher Education, 1972, 43, 44-62.

This article should be very high on the list of readings for any department chairman (or other faculty member) who is truly interested in making as strong a case as possible for an advancement in either rank or merit. Excellent discussions of both the nature of and the weight of evidence have been included.